

*Sub D2
C1*
transferring an aqueous solution containing the released nucleic acids to a second solution containing a binding accelerator, after the destroying step; and

transferring the aqueous solution containing the released nucleic acids to a third solution containing the accelerator for binding the nucleic acids to an adsorbing solid phase, after the step of transferring the aqueous solution to the second solution.

REMARKS

The Applicants have submitted new claims 20-32 in lieu of canceled claims 1-12 and 16-19. Therefore, claims 20-32 are now pending.


In the Final Office Action dated July 18, 2000, claims 1-12 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first and second paragraphs, on grounds that are moot in view of the new claims, which do not contain the language deemed objectionable by the Examiner. The Applicants make no admission as to the propriety of the rejections.

Claims 1-12 and 16-19 were also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boom et al, US 5,234,809, in view of Seligson et al, US 4,935,342. In view of the new claims, which contain language of different

scope than those rejected, the Applicants submit that the rejection is moot. Claims 20-32 patentably define over the prior art of record, whether taken individually or in combination.

The Applicants thus request examination of new claims 20-32.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: October 17, 2001